

Serial No. 10/675,224

Amendments to the Drawing

The attached sheet of drawing includes changes to FIG. 1. This sheet, which includes FIG. 1, replaces the original sheet including FIG. 1. In FIG. 1, the German labels have been removed or replaced with English equivalents.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

REMARKS

Applicants' undersigned attorney thanks the Examiner for her comments. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this Patent Application, particularly in view of the above Amendment and the following remarks. No additional fee is due for this Amendment because the number of independent claims remains unchanged and the total number of claims has decreased.

Request for a Telephone Interview

Applicants kindly request the Examiner contact the undersigned at (847) 490-1400 to schedule a telephone interview to discuss the merits of this Patent Application.

Amendment to the Drawing

Applicants have amended FIG. 1 to remove or translate German wording.

Amendment to the Specification

Applicants have provided the requested Substitute Specification and the marked copy thereof. Applicants have included support for limitations of Claim 3 in the Substitute Specification, with the support for this Amendment being found in original Claim 3.

Applicants have amended the Abstract for consistency with the Substitute Specification.

No new matter has been added to the Specification by this Amendment or the Substitute Specification.

Amendment to the Claims

Applicant has amended Claim 1 to include limitations of dependent Claim 16. Claims 5 and 16 have been canceled in view of amended Claim 1.

Claims 2, 3, 6-14, and 17-24 have been amended to correct dependencies, provide antecedent bases, correct typographical errors, and for clarity in response to the objections made in the Office Action.

No new matter has been added to the claims by this Amendment.

Drawing Objection

Applicants have amended FIG. 1 as requested in the Office Action.

Specification Objections

Applicants have amended the Specification for clarity as requested by the Office Action. If the Examiner deems any further change necessary, she is requested to contact the undersigned by telephone to discuss.

Claim Objections

Applicants have amended the claims to correct the typographical and grammatical errors identified in the Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 2, 3, and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Applicants have amended these claims for consistency as requested by the Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

The rejection of Claims 1-9, 13-20, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Kokubu et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,665,039, is respectfully traversed.

Applicants have amended Claim 1 to recite that the glass has an edge wavelength λ_c between 280 nm and 325 nm and a pure transmission degree of τ_{ip} in a pass range of greater than 98% and an optical density in a stop range of 1×10^{-5} with a sample thickness of 2 mm. The Kokubu et al. Patent does not disclose, or suggest to one skilled in the art how to obtain, a borosilicate glass meeting the limitations of amended Claim 1. The Kokubu et al. Patent does not inherently provide the recited limitations, despite the alleged overlapping range of component, as the Kokubu et al. Patent does not disclose how to provide, for example, the recited edge wavelength (See, for example, page 6, first paragraph, of Applicants' original Specification).

In view of the above comments and amended Claim 1, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

The rejection of Claims 1-5, 9-16, and 20-24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mennemann et al., U.S. Patent 4,562,161, is respectfully traversed.

Applicants have amended Claim 1 to recite that the glass has an edge wavelength λ_c between 280 nm and 325 nm and a pure transmission degree of τ_{ip} in a pass range of greater than 98% and an optical density in a stop range of 1×10^{-5} with a sample thickness of 2 mm. The Mennemann et al. Patent teaches that the disclosed glass “essentially” and “completely” absorbs the transmission of UV rays (Col. 2, lines 6-18).

In order to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, there must be some suggestion or motivation to modify the reference. The Mennemann et al. Patent provides glass that completely absorbs UV rays, and that this absorption is “essential.” The Mennemann et al. Patent thus teaches away from Applicants' invention of amended Claim 1, which recites “a transmission degree of τ_{ip} in a pass range of greater than 98%.” As the Mennemann et al. Patent teaches that the

Serial No. 10/675,224

absorption is essential, there is no suggestion or motivation to modify the teachings therein.

For at least the reasons given above, Applicants respectfully submit that the teachings of the Mennemann et al. Patent fail to disclose or suggest Applicants' claimed invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicants intend to be fully responsive to the outstanding Office Action. If the Examiner detects any issue which the Examiner believes Applicants have not resolved in this response, Applicant's undersigned attorney again requests a telephone interview with the Examiner.

Applicants sincerely believe that this Patent Application is now in condition for allowance and, thus, respectfully requests early allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark D. Swanson
Registration No. 48,498

Pauley Petersen & Erickson
2800 West Higgins Road, Suite 365
Hoffman Estates, Illinois 60195
(847) 490-1400
FAX (847) 490-1403